

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-12, 14-22, 25, and 27-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 25, 27, 28, and 29 are amended hereinabove and Claim 30 is added. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1, 5-12, 14-22, 25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu, et al. (hereinafter “Liu”) (“XWRAP: an XML-enabled wrapper construction system for Webinformation source”, Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Data Engineering, Publication Date: 2000, pgs. 611-621) in view of Keith (Patent Number 6,629,097).

With respect to independent claims 1, 5, 25, 27, and 28, Applicants have amended the claims to indicate that the knowledge container creator module creates at least a first data descriptor item and at least a second data descriptor item based upon a raw data item wherein the raw data item is itself in a plurality of different formats, including at least two of: formatted data, unformatted data, and data links. Applicants respectfully submit that this subject matter is described for example, in paragraphs 0037, 0038, and elsewhere in Applicants’ Specification. Among other advantages, the system may provide a knowledge container that may be searchable and usable by a variety of current and future query systems and provides multiple representations of the same underlying raw data, thereby facilitating re-use of the knowledge by a variety of current and future systems. This is accomplished by utilizing multiple representations of the same data, each in a different format, contained within a single data item. This improves compatibility while efficiently organizing the data and making it easily searchable and accessible. Other advantages will be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

Neither Liu nor Keith contemplate such subject matter. The office action admits that Liu does not disclose raw data items or data representing data that is in a plurality of different

formats. In addition, Keith, in the cited portion of col. 25, lns. 53-54 and col. 18, lns. 8-20, merely states that the different databases such as medical databases or law databases can be tapped for “input into the methods of the current invention”. Keith also discusses, as pointed out in the office action, the use of “any text source, such as news publications, works of literature, and periodicals” being used as input to the invention (column 18, lines 12-13). However, as described in Keith, each data item is only in a single format. In other words, although different databases and different text sources may be accessed, the raw data such as the business section of the *New York Times* is all in a single format. As such, each raw data item taught by Keith consists of information in a single format. The office action alleges that “among every text source that is available, not all of these text sources are in the same format” (pages 22-3). However, Keith gives no indication either that a source containing multiple formats may be used or that a single raw data item may contain a plurality of different formats that include at least two different formats of data. In sharp contrast sharp thereto, Applicants’ claim that each raw data item is in at least two different formats (out of formatted data, unformatted data, and data links). As shown for example in FIG. 6 and described in paragraph 0037 and elsewhere of Applicants’ Specification, the single raw data item 110 may be in multiple formats, including formatted data, unformatted data or data links. Not only does Keith fail to disclose the use of multiple formats for a single raw data item in general, Keith makes no mention of specifically using raw data items including at least two of formatted data, unformatted data, and data links. Accordingly, Keith does not teach what is alleged and independent claims 1, 5, 25, 27, and 28 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended claim 29 so as to make it independent. Claim 29 requires, in addition to other limitations, that:

“...the knowledge container creator module is operative to create the first data descriptor item in the form of a context descriptor that includes data indicating the purpose of a test and how the test was performed” (emphasis added).

The office action alleges that this limitation of claim 29 is disclosed by Lui’s “semantic knowledge in the form of rules” (section 2.1, pages 3-4, “Code Generation” paragraph). Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the cited portion of Lui refers to including “the purpose of a test” or “how the test was performed” in a descriptor item as required in Applicants’ claim. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the remainder of Lui nor Keith disclose providing context information in a descriptor item including a test’s purpose or how it was performed. As previously discussed, Lui addresses using “Web information sources” (page 2), while Keith deals with databases and text sources in general (column 18, lines 8-19). Neither reference considers using test information as input, as discussed in Applicants’ Specification in paragraph 0053 and elsewhere. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is patentable over the cited references and that claim 29 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants have added new claim 30 which finds support in at least paragraphs 0030, 0037 and 0073. Claim 30 adds the limitation that the raw data item consists of non-text information. By way of example, such non-text information could include video files. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lui nor Keith address the use of non-text information as raw data items and as such claim 30 is patentable over the cited references and is condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited

to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2010 /Christopher J. Reckamp/

By: _____
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003
312/609-7500
312/609-5005 Facsimile